Informal - For Discussion Purposes Only

Interview Agenda

Application No. 10/811,439   Attorney Docket No. 10761.1460-00000
Application No. 10/811,367   Attorney Docket No. 10761.1461-00000
Date: October 7, 2009 at 2:00 PM ET

I.   Overview of Status of Application.

        A.   Both applications facing non-final rejections.

II.   Overview of Invention.

        A.   Optimizes customer interactions by choosing and applying particular treatments.

        B.   Centralized, channel-independent processing engine across all channels of communication.

        C.   Central processing engine processes grouped rules in a hierarchy (such that overriding rules have priority over interaction rules).

IV.   § 103 Rejections

        A.   In our last amendment, all independent claims in both applications were amended to refer to this hierarchy of grouped rules, and to further point out that overriding rules have priority over interaction rules.

        B.   Distinctions between Invention and *Carey:*

                1.   *Carey* does not disclose a hierarchy of grouped rules as disclosed in Applicant's specification.

                2.   Applicant's specification describes its hierarchy of grouped rules in detail. See, e.g., ¶¶ 80 (describing overriding rules, trigger rules, event-based rules, and interaction rules); 82 (describing the engine processing the rules in a hierarchy); 84 (providing an example); 87 (discussing how engine processes rules). *See also* Figure 6.

VI.   Proposed Course of Action: Office Action Responses.

VII.   Conclusion: Interview Summary for each application.